



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,468	02/25/2002	Shawn Domenic Loveland	13768.254	4394

47973 7590 03/30/2007
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,468

Applicant(s)

LOVELAND ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph B. Avellino

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 and 35-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 and 35-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 and 35-39 are pending in this application. The Office acknowledges the addition of claims 37-39

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 30, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-7, 11-18, 21-29, 31 and 35-39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (U.S. 2002/0194307 A1) hereinafter 'Anderson' in view of Oppenheimer et al (US 2003/0014477 A1) hereinafter "Oppenheimer" in view of Eldridge et al. (USPN 6,397,261) (hereinafter Eldridge II).

Regarding claims 1, 11-12, 21-23, 30-31 and 35-36, Anderson taught, sending from the client over the wireless network a document inclusion instruction to the server,

not including the document, but including an identification of the document that does not depend on the server prior knowledge about the document, therefore the server would retrieve the document based on the client identification of the document (see section 0040 of the specifications [e.g. fetching or querying the store or a database with a list of the content of the store]) and not based on the server prior knowledge of existing attachable files (Anderson: fig.1 [mobile device 153] and paragraphs 0025, 0030-0036); **and** (as per claims 1, 11, 23 and 30) if the identified document is already stored at the server, the client's document-inclusion being sufficient to permit the server to carry out the instruction and the client therefore taking no further action (Anderson: paragraphs 0036-0038 and 0039 [explaining client's action that do not depend on whether the document is identifiable or not]). Furthermore Anderson discloses displaying to a user an indication that the document is attached to a message in response to user input received instructing a document stored at the client to be attached to the message (p. 3, ¶ 30).

Anderson did not expressly taught details regarding the course of action to be performed after the server indicates to the client that the file was not found (Anderson: paragraph 0077).

Oppenheimer taught sending an identifier of a file to be used to determine if another copy of the file is already stored on the server 204, then if the file already exist in the server no further action ("need not be uploaded") is required by the user

(Oppenheimer: paragraph 0045), but if the identified document is not already store at the server, then receiving from the server an indication that the document identified in the document-inclusion instruction is unavailable so the client may determine whether to send the identified document of not (Oppenheimer: paragraph 0046); **or** (as per claims 21 and 35) ensuring that a document-inclusion operation corresponding to the document-inclusion instruction is performed by the client if and only if the client is advised by the server that the identified document is not already stored at the server so as to conserve the network bandwidth of the wireless network (Oppenheimer: paragraph 0046).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art working with Anderson at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Anderson with the teachings of Oppenheimer, since both motivated the exploration of the art of retrieving a document on behalf of a user and indicating the user that the file is not found within the server (Oppenheimer: 0045-0046 and Anderson: 0036-0037 and 0040). The combination would have improved Anderson teachings by providing the document retrieval operation even when the file is available to the client (Oppenheimer: 0045) and further providing a clear course of action to provide the document to the server when the server is not able to find the document (Oppenheimer: 0046). Oppenheimer furthermore explains that the client is in control "whether the file is actually uploaded" (§ 46), thereby meeting the limitation "determining whether to upload the file to the server".

Anderson in view of Oppenheimer did not specifically state displaying to a user an indication that the document is attached to a message even when the document is

not attached to the message. In analogous art, Eldridge II discloses another client that is connectable over a wireless network to a server so that the client may transmit document inclusion operations (i.e. tokens) that are intended to be carried out by the server which displays to a user an indication that the document is attached to a message even when the document is not attached to the message, such that whether or not the document is actually attached is transparent to the user (i.e. the user is not notified that a document token is substituted; "large attachment files are automatically replaced by sender's email client 202") (col. 7, lines 15-29, 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Eldridge with Anderson and Oppenheimer in order to provide a way to transmit secure documents which would minimize the impact on data throughput on email servers when large files are attached to email servers as supported by Eldridge II (col. 2, lines 25-30).

Anderson modified by the teachings of Oppenheimer and Eldridge II is hereinafter referenced to as the combination.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 24 and 25, the combination further taught sending the document-inclusion instruction in a new electronic mail message and forwarding an electronic mail message (Anderson: 0040 ["then the user may specify a destination address for the document 189 in the request email message transmitted to the document retriever 186"])).

Regarding claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 26 and 27, the combination further taught that the calendar capabilities were included in the range of capabilities offered by PDA's and other portable devices (Anderson: 0002). The examiner additionally notes that other portable devices include personal portable computers (laptops) with extended processing capabilities. It is further noticed that such portable devices such as laptop computers were commonly equipped with electronic mail clients such as MS Outlook® (MUA or Mail User Agent) to interface with electronic mail servers such as MS Exchange (MTA or Mail Transfer Agent). It is further noticed that MS Outlook® and MS Exchange provided document attachment capabilities in meeting requests at the time the instant invention was made. Since extending the attachment capabilities to other services provided by an email client was already well known in the art, extending document inclusion capabilities related to the elimination of attachments to such other services would be a matter of choice.

Regarding claims 6, 7, 17, 18, 28 and 29, the combination further taught printing in a particular printer using the document-inclusion instruction (Anderson: 0040 [*"The reply email message is then transmitted to the corresponding automated print agent 166 designated to receive the emails addressed to the printer alias 186 wherever it resides in the local area network 109 to print the document 189 on the printer 136 as was described previously"*])).

2. Claims 37-39 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Note that since the limitation "indicating that a different version is acceptable" is a conditional limitation based on the condition that "the document is not stored at the server" it does not necessarily have to occur. Therefore, in the broadest, reasonable interpretation of the claim, the claim limitations can be satisfied if, when the document is found at the server, inserting the document into the email as specified by the document-inclusion instruction, which has been taught by the rejections above. By this rationale, the rejection for claims 37-39 is rejected for similar reasons as stated for the claims above.

3. Claims 8, 9, 10, 19, 20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (U.S. 2002/0194307 A1) hereinafter 'Anderson' in view of Oppenheimer et al (US 2003/0014477 A1) hereinafter "Oppenheimer" in view of Eldridge II and further in view of LaRue et al. (U.S. 6,535,892 B1) hereinafter 'LaRue'.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 10, 19, 20 the combination taught the invention substantially as claimed, however the combination did not expressly teach details regarding a client and a server performing a version update process upon identifying that the requested version is unavailable. Nevertheless, the combination motivated the exploration of the art of using a digest or file identification information to determine if an identical version of the file is already stored within server 204 as appropriate (Oppenheimer: 0045).

LaRue taught a client that determines version conflicts between client and server versions of the same document, the client sending version indicator and the changes in

Art Unit: 2143

comparison with the found version in order to synchronize a dataset (column 12 line 48 to column 13 line 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination with the teachings of LaRue *in order to resolve version conflicts* (column 12 line 48 to column 13 line 37). Note that sending the whole document in a synchronization process is a normal procedure when document is not found at all, since there is no document to synchronize with. One of ordinary skill in the art working with the combination would be motivated to explore the art of electronic messaging and the use of portable devices to access a messaging system (Anderson: [0002 and 0008]); which is also part of LaRue disclosure (column 1 lines 59-64, column 2 lines 32-46 and column 3 lines 1-31). One of ordinary skill in the art would also be motivated the exploration of the art of using a digest or file identification information to determine if an identical version of the file is already stored within server 204 as appropriate (Oppenheimer: 0045). Therefore, combining the combination with the teachings of LaRue (column 12 line 48 to column 13 line 37) would provide a resolution mechanism to act in response to a negative notification, responsive to a document-inclusion instruction (Anderson: 0076-0077). *The combination would have resulted improved by adding an efficient method to further overcome problems entailed by a document not found error or an outdated version.*

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments dated January 30, 2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
2. In the remarks, Applicant argues, in substance, that (1) the rejection for claim 1 does not provide for the client determining whether to upload the file.
3. As to point (1), as outlined above for the rejection to claim 1, it is believed that this feature is taught by Oppenheimer (§ 46). By this rationale, the rejection is maintained. Furthermore, an embodiment of the claim as shown above does not even require that this feature be needed to be taught. This feature is only needed if the file is not found on the server. If the file is actually on the server, then no further action is needed by the client. This clearly satisfies the requirements of the claim and therefore this argument is moot.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


5. The Examiner believes that the recitation of version management as described in claims 37 and 39 would overcome the cited prior art of record if the claim requires this limitation to be met. As the claim is written, the limitation does not have to be met in order to meet the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Avellino', is written over the printed name.

Joseph E. Avellino, Examiner
March 23, 2007